

The Daily Tar Heel

76 Years of Editorial Freedom

Wayne Hurder, Editor
Bill Staton, Business Manager



Dale Gibson, Managing Editor
Rebel Good, News Editor
Joe Sanders, Features Editor
Owen Davis, Sports Editor
Scott Goodfellow, Associate Editor
Kermit Buckner, Jr., Advertising Manager

Letters To The Editor

Coed Visitation 'Objectionable'

Editor: How about NON-VISITATION RIGHTS? Visitation includes hallways as well as individual rooms; thus it affects every person and not just those residents desiring visitors. It is not a "take it or leave it" policy guaranteeing the full implications of the LIBERTY OF NON-VISITATION to those who want to "leave" it. To have one or two open house afternoons a year (to show friends one's habitat) is a good idea. Anything more encroaches upon others. A dorm without visitation seems unlikely, since the trend of student voters is often to avoid being called "conservative," even if that's not the point, or to allow others certain "freedoms" which may infringe upon their own rights. In France last year, I lived in a dorm

where freedom of visitation existed temporarily in May. For many girls, the disadvantages outweighed the advantages (like meeting guys on the hall in your nightclothes, and having a few male coeds). Besides, it seems to me that the visitation issue there was a sort of "rousing agent" in the prelude to student agitation concerning University reforms, which protest was then infiltrated and directed towards social revolt on a national level. It is a sign of immaturity to vote for or against anything simply because it has been tagged "liberal" or "conservative." Likewise, there appears to be a lack of depth in an article which pulls for votes by obvious manipulation of such labels to get what it wants, and by the fabrication of as questionable a syllogistic system as

this: A) Progress is desirable. B) "Liberalism" is progress. (?) C) Therefore "Liberalism" is desirable. A) "Liberalism" is desirable. B) Dorm visitation is "liberalism." C) Therefore dorm visitation is desirable. A) UNC should strive to be one of the "most liberal" campuses in the state. B) Two other universities in the state have dorm visitation ("liberal policy"), thus forging ahead of UNC in the liberalism race. C) Therefore UNC must endorse dorm visitation in order to preserve its liberal reputation. The logic speaks for itself. Much depends on the definition of "liberalism" as it relates to the status quo, implying that, inherently, the former is good and the latter is bad. Should not anything be judged on its own merits within the

whole framework of life? Sincerely,
Gloria Huffman
227 East Cobb

'And Nothing Beside Remains'

Editor: Eulogy For Kathy It is said that taxes and death are the only two sure things in this world. A tax is the price one pays for making money. Death is the price one pays for living. Saturday, two rather insignificant lives were totaled up; their price was paid. They weren't SAE's or Tri-Delts or Porcellians. They were just two people who left empty dorm rooms and a lot of clothing for their parents to give away. And they left their memory behind, too. Their parents and their close friends will grieve, but life will go on, and the whole thing will soon be forgotten. After all, people die every minute of every day. And even important people will be remembered by only a few.

But to those few who do remember, there exists a void which will never, ever be filled. No one else will care after a while. Life goes on, and so do parties, Corvettes and quizzes. The mass of The University is busy making money, making water restrictions and writing blazing editorials.

Kathy Bowman won't be here to read the editorials, not to observe the water restrictions, nor even to pay her tuition. Her total has already been rung up, and she has paid the price. To her dear friend, Lois, Kathy's absence will be a heavy burden. To her I say, "Be strong, and carry on." To everyone else, I say, "Slow down, and live." And right now, thank somebody, even if it's yourself, that it wasn't your total being rung up on Saturday; that your price wasn't paid and that your dorm room is still full.

Rick Oppenheimer
113-B Todd Street

Nixon's Proposal Reveals Misunderstanding Of Youth

Richard Nixon, Wednesday, promised the youth of America that if he were elected president he would create a new role for the young, who feel "overpowered, over-patronized, and over-protected." Nixon said he would create a youth service agency whose "byword will be challenge, not handout." It would consist of an open channel section, sports and fitness program, world youth activity, and an ombudsman for youths. Nixon's idea, which may sound good to some middle-class suburbanite who wonders what is happening to the youth of America, totally misses out as an attempt to quiet the angry activists youths in America. What he offers them is the last thing they want—participation in the Establishment of America. Nixon apparently thinks the political activists of the type that support McCarthy, Dick Gregory, or Eldridge Cleaver for president simply want a "piece of the action." He thinks they can be bought off by creating a special agency for them to channel their activities into, just like Lyndon Johnson created the Office of Economic Opportunity in an effort to quiet the poor. A suggestion such as that offered by Nixon, however, will do nothing for youths, just as OEO did little for the poor, because the Establishment, that Nixon wants to get the youths into, will not allow youths the power to make the changes in the American social and political system that they want to. This is precisely what has happened with OEO. Whenever an OEO funded poverty organization that was truly democratic and truly

representative of the poor tried to use some power to change their local power structure they quickly found all their power withdrawn by Washington upon request from the local power structure. After this drive for self-improvement on the part of local poor had been killed, it has been characteristic for the local poverty program to be turned over to the local politicians to use in rewarding faithful followers, and others who know their place. This has been a characteristic cycle for the OEO throughout the South in Alabama, Mississippi, etc., and in Northern cities, such as Chicago. So what do you think the Establishment will do for youths who agitate for the elimination of the lifeblood of the Establishment—namely, the draft, the Vietnamese war, support of foreign dictatorships, etc. It certainly will not allow it possession of a governmental agency with power: it will either rob that agency of any power or see to it that those in control of the agency aren't too pushy, make sure they know which side their bread is buttered on. No, most activists youths in America won't accept what Nixon is offering. They realize that it is an attempt to drown out the sound of the activists calling for change by forcing them into the Establishment.



Ernest J. Yanarella

1968—Low Ebb Of Politics Evident

"This has been a tragic year for America... It has been like a Shakespearean chronicle—at the end of every act, they carry dead bodies off the stage."
—Theodore H. White

Despite the tendencies towards stridency and melodrama in the personal account of my experiences at Chicago, (DTH, Oct. 4 and 5) the significant question towards which it has been moving should not be obscured or trivialized. That question is: in a situation like the one the American electorate faces today, where meaningful, qualitative choice has been denied it, what is the moral person to do? Humphrey is a political Faust, who sold his liberal soul to Lyndon "Mephistopheles" Johnson for a chance to be President. Nixon is an anachronism, a throw-back to an anxious, witch-hunting era whose ethos lingers on. Wallace is, pure and simple, a demagogue, who has taken central strands of populism and perverted them for his selfish benefit. Declarative, comparative, superlative: evil, more evil, demonic; corrupt, more corrupt, bankrupt. What is to be done? To vote for any one of the three major presidential contenders means, for the true citizen, to accept complicity in the immorality of past, continuing or future policies. For one, foreign; for another, domestic and foreign; for the third, spiritual. What is to be done? One option for voters is to register their dissent by not voting for president. A low ballot tally vis-a-vis the total votes for other offices would give some indication of the degree of disaffection among the American citizenry. Yet, such a protest is so general that it is offers whoever is elected no clear guides as to how he can renew respect and legitimacy to the political process. Besides, for the responsible individual, the force of the sign above the gates of Dante's Inferno is compelling: "The worst places in Hell are reserved for those who in a time of crisis remain neutral." The decision not to choose may in itself be a choice; but something clearer, stronger, and more concrete seems to be called for. Voting for Humphrey—thus, selecting the lesser evil—is a second alternative. The logic behind this choice is evident. Humphrey is, after all, some kind of liberal; and he will give some kind of liberal response to the plight of the inhabitants of the urban ghettos, to "the wretched of the earth," and to the issues of war and peace. Still, the lesser of two (now three) evils, as the morally-conscious youth of today have repeatedly emphasized, is still evil. Compromise is what compromise

accomplishes. Sometimes, one can compromise his ideals so much that he has nothing left. Then, he becomes... well, ... a Humphrey. Those of us who have taken that fateful step across the boundary line separating compromise from moral intransigency on some issues find two options open. One involves going to the streets and engaging in the politics of confrontation and disruption. This strategy says, in effect, to the prevailing powers, "Stop your evil ways or we will bring the machine that drives you to a grinding halt." Tom Hayden and Rennie Davis, as we saw, subscribe to this policy and in Chicago tried to put it into operation. Naturally, it has its merits and its liabilities. Sometimes it works, as in Berkeley and Columbia; sometimes not—notably in Chicago and at the Pentagon. My point is that it is one instrument among many, not the only instrument, for effecting change. In addition, to employ it indiscriminately and to purposely court repression in so doing, is to have a very short memory and a very naive view of American history. Repressive America in time of war or national crisis imprisons or kills its dissenters. For these reasons, and others, the other avenue seems more fruitful—that is, moral reconstruction through the fashioning of a new party. The mechanism of the party has traditionally been the vehicle for generating consciousness of existing conditions and for arousing and disseminating new visions of the future. With the loosening of party loyalties, the infusion of youth into the political process, and the increasing growth of our national economy and its technological potential, historical trends are emerging which, if seized and welded by a party mechanism, could help remedy those very social ills so deeply plaguing us. Are we genuinely serious about eradicating the defects of contemporary American society, now that we have the technical capacity? Or do we "merely" wish to end the killing in Vietnam? That issue is important, and its resolution is imperative. The question being asked, however, is a more comprehensive one: is our protest a single-issue one or is it broad-based? If we are seriously concerned with alleviating misery and deprivation, we must begin to grapple with these issues: purging our leaders and ourselves of the tacit assumptions underlying our involvement in Vietnam; developing programs to decolonize the ghettos in our major cities; and dismantling the authoritarian structures which control and manipulate us in our everyday lives. Which is to say, if we are sincere, we must be radical and political, simultaneously.

Which groups are the potential elements of this new coalition? The emerging stratum of committed youth on the campuses is one source for members. The intellectuals, at least those who haven't been bought off by the lures of technological society, are a second well-spring. Not to be slighted are the more pragmatic of the black militants in the ghettos. Moreover, the "conscience community" in the white suburbs tapped by McCarthy in the primaries may also provide representatives. However, to be effective as a political force, any new party must seek to draw members ultimately from a wide spectrum of American society—even from the ranks of George Wallace's supporters. Judging from an encounter of my own, I don't think this prospect is too far-fetched. While campaigning last Easter vacation in a coal town in Pennsylvania for Gene McCarthy, I came upon a coal miner who, in the course of our talk, assured me that he would vote for McCarthy in the primary. When, for curiosity sake, I inquired who he would switch to if McCarthy was not nominated, he replied, "Well, I guess I'll vote for Wallace." The point is this: Wallace is satanic and seeking office for personal gain. His supporters, however, deserve more careful attention, especially the vision or image of the future some of them are attempting to articulate and communicate, even if poorly. At a minimum, they seem to desire a politics of clear-cut issues and straight talk. Perhaps, too, they are searching for a coherent picture of who or what is manipulating them and causing such frustration and anxiety in their inner lives, as well as their productive lives. It would be the paramount duty of a fourth party to link private maladies to outward social institutions and superficially controlled economic oligopolies and corporations. From there, the task would be to suggest alternative modes of political, social, and economic organization. If I am not just whistling in the wind and historical possibilities do exist now which, through slow, painful organizational work, can be intertwined into a new revolutionizing political instrument, a new dawn for American politics may be at hand. If, that is, this opportunity is taken hold of. Even if these possibilities are non-existent or prematurely crystallized, the endeavor to shape a new radical along the lines described above would not have been in vain. For, though the destiny of this project might be to go the way of third parties in the past, such assimilation of even a part of the program of this envisaged party by the Democratic party would redound to the benefit of some alienated sector of the American

populace. And simply to raise the level of political dialogue in this country would be no small accomplishment. In any case, the rightward drift of contemporary American politics must be countered by some political mechanism. The thrust of my plea is that we try now. The remnants of grassroots McCarthy organizations abound from coast to coast. The New Party, the Peace and Freedom Party, and the Freedom and Peace Party exist, too. The need for new politics and new visions is pressing. All that is necessary is the will. So, a ray of hope and optimism glimmers in the far-off horizon. But, you may ask, what shall we do in the short-run on Election Day in November? To this query, I have no ready or easy answer. For myself, conscience dictates that I vote as a symbolic gesture for a fourth party candidate. The hate-filled oratory of Eldridge Cleaver, stemming from a literary gifted, but penal mentality, would seem to preclude my voting for him on the Peace and Freedom ticket. The socialist parties either are offering no presidential candidate for this election and/or are intellectually moribund. Since I am registered to vote in New York, I shall take the option of casting my absentee ballot for Dick Gregory, candidate of the Freedom and Peace Party. This action will signal to those people in high office with humane motives and sensibilities my allegiance to a genuinely new politics and a radically new and reconstructed perspective on the shape of America's future. Albert Camus has written: "by our silence or by the stand we take, we too shall enter the fray." By the stand I shall take, I choose, not only to enter the fray, but to convey some token meaning, some small message, to whoever will listen. Little more personally can be salvaged in these bleak, melancholy times. Between now and November 5th, nothing more can be demanded. The body count—one near-saint, one humane politician—is too high as it is to require more from one person.

Letters

ALL LETTERS TO THE EDITOR ARE WELCOMED. THEY SHOULD BE CONCISE, TYPED AND A DUPLICATE COPY MUST BE ENCLOSED.

Presidential Aspirants Revise History Of U.S. Revolution

FROM THE KENTUCKY KERNEL A review of "The Revised History of America," edited by Hubert Humphrey, Richard Nixon and George Wallace. A completely revised version of American History is scheduled to go on sale in most bookstores by early next month. The new book is unique in that it takes a dim view of the American Revolution. Rumors persist to crop up saying that editors Humphrey, Nixon and Wallace rewrote American history because they feel the precedent set by the war of independence has been overemphasized and is leading the youth of America astray. "After all," Nixon has been quoted as saying, "If the American Revolution is justifiable, you might as well say 'The Revolution' (the current movement among young people) is also justifiable." In order to make American history compatible with their campaign speeches, the three editors reportedly united "for the common good" to rewrite the story of America. To this end, America's Revolutionary leaders are portrayed in the revised text as "anarchists, ne'er do wells and spoiled brats." The book does allow exceptions to this picture, as in the case of George Washington and other founding fathers, who are described as "well-meaning but perhaps slightly misled by the radicals." Editor Wallace, however, cast a dissenting footnote saying, "Although Washington and his pointed-head cronies may not have

been smelly, they had just as long hair as any anarchists I've ever seen... and they sure dressed awfully frivolous—nothing like you'd ever see in Alabama." This refreshingly different view of American history is maintained throughout the entire chronologicalization of the Revolutionary period. As for criticism of the new history text, one can say only that it is pity the book did not get further along. The editors/authors had intended originally to revise American History through current times. But they managed to get only to the Civil War. It was at this point that a horrible schism of opinion developed among the three. Nixon and Humphrey maintained that in this war it was the confederacy who should be pictured as the anarchists, etc. But Wallace apparently could not accept this contention. When confronted by his two co-editors with evidence to support their position, Wallace is said to have screamed in horror, after which he fled to a closet somewhere in Alabama where he locked himself up for a long period of time. In the meantime Nixon and Humphrey were forced to release their incomplete text in order to meet the election day deadline. This reviewer, after much effort, managed to reach Wallace by telephone and persuade him to break his silence on the Civil War history matter. "It just can't be, it just can't be," he sobbed pitifully. "That isn't the way my mother told it."